

Andrea M. Walker  
3495 Keir Drive Helena MT 59602  
406-475-3568 – [timndria@aol.com](mailto:timndria@aol.com)

EXHIBIT 14  
DATE 2/16/09  
HB 252

February 15, 2009

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am here to voice opposition to HB252.

While our government allows freedom for sexual preference and lifestyle choices, this bill would seek to compromise the freedoms of those would not choose to participate in or endorse a homosexual lifestyle.

A group such as the Boy Scouts has determined the homosexual leaders should not be role models for the boys participating in their organization. The Supreme Court Decision in the "Dale" case has affirmed the Boy Scout's belief and right to determine this.

I quote the BSA public statement from June 2000. "The Boys Scouts of America as a private organization must have the right to establish its own standards of membership if it is to continue to instill the values of the Scout Oath and Law in the boys. Thanks to our legal victories, our standards of membership have been sustained. We believe an avowed homosexual is not a role model for the values espoused in the Scout Oath and Law. Boy Scouting makes no effort to discover the sexual orientation of any person. Scouting's message is compromised when prospective leaders present themselves as role models inconsistent with Boy Scouting's understanding of the the Scout Oath and Law"

If these proposed changes to current law proceed and the state includes sexual preference and lifestyle choices as a basis of discrimination, I fear groups such as the Boys Scouts would be at risk. Groups promoting traditional beliefs, such as Boys Scouts, would either have to compromise their standard of belief or face loss. They would face loss of use of public properties. The scouts currently use state lands for their events such as multi-troop camporees, hikes, weekend camps, and other outings. Many troops hold their weekly meetings in state or city government buildings; their use of these buildings would also be threatened because of their stand against homosexual leadership.

Another example would be a church that finds homosexuality unacceptable by their study of the Bible as their standard of conduct. Again, based on the inclusion of lifestyle choices as a basis for discrimination, said church could lose its ability to speak freely to its members under the threat of consequences in the loss of use of public lands or public buildings.

I do not believe it appropriate or just for the legislature to compromise the freedoms of individual groups to govern its membership according to their standard of belief because another group demands sanction for those who disagree with their choices.

Homosexuals have the freedom to choose to live as their preferences indicate. I do not believe that it should require a concession of the freedoms of groups and individuals that do not agree with these lifestyle choices under threat of loss of privilege to public access.

I respectfully ask that you table this legislation.

Sincerely,

Andrea M. Walker